REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 8, 14-16, 18-29, 31, 32-34, and 36-38 have been amended. Claims 1-38 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9-24, 26-31 and 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,593 (***Eames***). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. ***Eames*** discloses a communication system providing telephone service to subscribers using line cards which are pluggable into a broadband network unit. The line cards of ***Eames*** provide telephone service to up to six lines per card. The cards are programmable from a central location, and the system includes self-testing of the cards, ring generator testing and provides for testing of the telephone lines from the system to the subscriber's location.

Eames fails to teach one or more of the claimed features. Claim 1, for example, is directed to a method to reduce false switch hook detection in a line card coupled to a subscriber loop via a ring and tip terminal. The method includes receiving a control signal and storing a value representative of a voltage level between the ring and tip terminal in response to receiving the control signal. The method further includes determining an initial condition of a second state of the line card and operating in the second state of the line card in response to receiving the control signal, wherein the second state begins to operate from the determined initial condition.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, acknowledges that ***Eames*** fails to teach storing a value representative of a voltage level between the ring and tip terminal in response to receiving the control signal. As described in the patent application, and also claimed in claims 3 and 8, this stored voltage value is thereafter employed, in one embodiment, to determine when to provide

the ringing signal (see claim 3) to the subscriber loop or when to stop the ringing signal (see claim 8). The claimed feature of storing a value representative of a voltage level between the ring and tip terminal in response to receiving the control signal is also not taught by ***Skidanenko***, even assuming the two references can be combined. ***Skidanenko*** is directed to floating a DC current source for a subscriber loop circuit. The portion of text relied by the Examiner at col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 23 of ***Skidanenko*** does not teach or disclose this claimed feature. The text cited by the Examiner is directed to storing energy in the primary winding, and not to storing a value representative of a voltage level between the ring and tip terminal in response to receiving the control signal (the "control signal" according to the Examiner corresponds to the RING_EN* signal of ***Eames***). Thus, for this reason alone, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

The dependent claims are allowable for the additional claimed features recited therein. For example, claim 3 calls for providing the ringing signal to the subscriber loop in response to the ringing signal crossing the stored voltage value. None of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach this claimed feature.

Claim 7 calls for determining the initial condition based on a ratio of a full scale current value in the first state and a full scale current value in the second state. The Examiner argues that this claimed feature is taught by ***Eames*** because it discloses providing a constant current feed where currents from one state to another are inherently determined by a ratio. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's application of ***Eames***. The Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to claim 1, which, among other things, calls for operating in the second state of the line card in response to receiving the control signal, wherein the second state begins

to operate from the determined initial condition. Thus, when claim 7 is read in view of its independent claim, claim 7 is directed to determining the "initial condition" in a particular way (*i.e.,* based on the ratio of the full scale current values), where the second state of the line card then begins to operate from this determined initial condition. ***Eames*** fails to disclose the claimed feature of "second state" of the line card beginning based on this ratio of the full scale current values. Accordingly, claim 7 is further allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 8 calls for further activating the switch hook detection in the line card in response to providing the ringing signal. ***Eames*** fails to teach this additional feature. In fact, Table 2 of ***Eames***, the very description relied upon by the Examiner in the Office Action, discloses the that switch hook detection (*i.e.,* the "Loop Detector," according to the Examiner) is turned off during the ringing state. That is, Table 2 shows that the Loop Detector is deactivated in the ringing state. Claim 8 is thus allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 15 calls for stopping the ringing signal in response to the ringing signal crossing the stored voltage value. None of the cited references, when taken alone or in combination, teach this claimed feature. Accordingly, for this additional reason claim 15 is also allowable.

Other dependent claims are also allowable for the additional features recited therein. Independent claims 19, 31, 36, as well as claims depending therefrom, are also allowable for one or more of the reasons presented above.

Independent claims 37 and 38 are further allowable because the cited references, taken alone or in combination, at least fail to teach disabling switch hook detection in the line card in response to determining that the ring trip has occurred.

Independent claims 1, 19, 31, 36, 37, and 38, are allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Additionally, dependent claims 2-7, 9-18, 20-24, 26-30, and 33-35, which depend from independent claims 1, 19, 31, and 37, respectively, are also allowable for at least the reasons cited above.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. In light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-38 are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4064 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 12, 2004

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

By: _____

Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)